arXiv:1511.09126v1 [math.NT] 30 Nov 2015

# An inverse theorem in $\mathbb{F}_p$ and rainbow free colorings.

Mario Huicochea
CINNMA
San Isidro 303 Juriquilla Fracc. Villas del Mesón
76226 Qro., México
E-mail: dym@cimat.mx

**Abstract**

Let $\mathbb{F}_p$ be the field with $p$ elements with $p$ prime, $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with at least 3 elements such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| \leq p-5$, and $\mathbb{S}_n$ the set of permutations of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. If $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^*$ are not all equal, we characterize the subsets $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ which satisfy

$$\left| \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\sigma(i)} X_i \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i|.$$

This result has the following application: For $n \geq 2$, $b \in \mathbb{F}_p$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ as above, we characterize the colorings $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} C_i = \mathbb{F}_p$ where each color has at least 3 elements such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x_i = b$ has not rainbow solutions.

*Keywords:* inverse theorems; rainbow free colorings

## 1. Introduction

In this article $p$ is a prime number, $\mathbb{F}_p$ the field with $p$ elements, ${\mathbb{F}_p}^* := \mathbb{F}_p \backslash \{0\}$, $\mathbb{S}_n$ is the set of permutations of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, and $[s]$ the greatest integer less than or equal to $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Identifying $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, if $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\overline{x}$ is its image under the canonical projection $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p$, define $[x, y] := \left\{x, x+\overline{1}, \ldots, x+\overline{i}\right\}$ where $i$ is the element of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\overline{i} = y - x$. For $r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ and $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$, write $rX := \{rx : \ x \in X\}$. Readily $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ is an arithmetic progression with common difference $r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ if and only if there are $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X = r[x, y]$. An important and trivial fact that will be used several times is the following

$$r[x, y] = (-r)[-y, -x] \qquad \forall\, r, x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p.$$

Given $X$ and $Y$ subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$, it is natural to ask whether $X$ and $Y$ have a particular structure when their sumset $X + Y$ is *small*; the answers to this question are known as inverse theorems. Vosper [11] found the first non-trivial inverse theorem; also Hamidoune and Rødseth [7] obtained an important inverse theorem with really few conditions on $|X|$ and $|Y|$, see Section 2 for the precise

statement. Also for special subsets $X$ and $Y$ of $\mathbb{F}_p$ there exist interesting inverse theorems; for instance Freiman [5] improved Vosper Theorem if $X = Y$, and Serra and Zémor [10] generalized also Vosper Theorem. It is natural to ask whether we can generalize these results for arbitrarily many subsets $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ of $\mathbb{F}_p$; Conlon [2] provided a generalization of Vosper and Hamidoune-Rødseth Theorems for $n \geq 3$ when $\min_{1\leq i\leq n} |X_i| \geq n+1$, $\left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right| \leq p-1$ and $p \geq 3n^2 - 4n - 3$. The main result of this paper is the following inverse theorem.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $n \geq 2$ and $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\min_{1\leq i\leq n} |X_i| \geq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n |X_i| \leq p-5$. If $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^*$ are not all equal, one of the following statements holds true:*

*(i) $n = 2, a_1 = -a_2$ and $\{X_1, X_2\} = \{r[x,y], r([y+c, x-c] \setminus \{z\})\}$ for some $x, y, c, r, z \in \mathbb{F}_p$.*

*(ii) $|\bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_n} \sum_{i=1}^n a_{\sigma(i)} X_i| > \sum_{i=1}^n |X_i|$.*

If $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ are pairwise disjoint subset of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^n C_i = \mathbb{F}_p$, we say $\mathcal{C} = \{C_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a n-coloring of $\mathbb{F}_p$. Given a n-coloring $\mathcal{C}$ and an equation $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b$ with $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^*$ and $b \in \mathbb{F}_p$, we say that $\mathcal{C}$ is rainbow free with respect to this equation if $\sum_{i=1}^n a_{\sigma(i)} v_i \neq b$ for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n$ and $v_i \in C_i$. For $\lambda, \mu, x \in \mathbb{F}_p$, write

$$S_{(\lambda,\mu)}(x) := \left\{ \lambda^k x + \left( \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \lambda^i \right) \mu : \ k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Jungić *et al.* [8] showed that the inverse theorems are powerful tools to study the rainbow colorings. In the case where $n = 3$, explicit characterizations of the equations that have rainbow free colorings are provided for example in [8], [9] and [6]. For arbitrary $n$ Conlon [2] showed that under the assumptions $\min_{1\leq i\leq n} |C_i| \geq n$ and $p \geq 3n^2 - 4n - 3$, $\mathcal{C}$ is rainbow free with respect to $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i = b$ only if $a_1 = \ldots = a_n$. As an application of Theorem 1.1, we improve Conlon's lower bound taking 3 instead of $n$ except in a very particular case; more precisely we show the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let $n \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{C} := \{C_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a $n-$coloring of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $|C_i| \geq 3$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. If $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^*$ are not all equal and $b \in \mathbb{F}_p$, $\mathcal{C}$ is rainbow free with respect to*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b \tag{1.1}$$

*if and only if the following conditions are satisfied*

*(i) $n = 2$.*

*(ii) There are $z_1, \ldots, z_m, y_1 \ldots, y_q \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that*

$$C_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^m S_{\left(-a_2 a_1^{-1}, b a_1^{-1}\right)}(z_i) \qquad \text{and} \qquad C_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^q S_{\left(-a_2 a_1^{-1}, b a_1^{-1}\right)}(y_i). \tag{1.2}$$

The paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2 we establish the main tools of Additive Number Theory that will be used in the following sections. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.1 for $n = 2$ and in Section 4 we show it for $n = 3$. To show Theorem 1.1, we need to study some special cases when $n > 3$ and this is done in Section 5. In Section 6 we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 and we conclude the proof of Theorem 1.2 in Section 7.

## 2. Preliminaries

First we recall some important results

**Theorem 2.1.** (Cauchy-Davenport) *If $X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ are not empty, then*

$$|X_1 + X_2| \geq \min\{p, |X_1| + |X_2| - 1\}.$$

*Proof.* See [3] and [4]. □

**Theorem 2.2.** (Vosper) *Let $X_1$ and $X_2$ be subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that*

$$\min\{|X_1|, |X_2|\} \geq 2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad |X_1| + |X_2| - 1 = |X_1 + X_2| \leq p - 2.$$

*Then there are $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_1 = r[x_1, y_1]$ and $X_2 = r[x_2, y_2]$.*

*Proof.* See [11]. □

**Theorem 2.3.** (Hamidoune-Rødseth) *Let $X_1$ and $X_2$ be subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that*

$$\min\{|X_1|, |X_2|\} \geq 3 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 7 \leq |X_1| + |X_2| = |X_1 + X_2| \leq p - 4.$$

*Then there are $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, z_2, r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_1 = r([x_1, y_1] \setminus \{z_1\})$ and $X_2 = r([x_2, y_2] \setminus \{z_2\})$.*

*Proof.* See [7]. □

**Proposition 2.4.** *Assume that $p \geq 11$. If $X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ are such that $|X_1| = |X_2| = 3$ and $|X_1 + X_2| \leq 6$, then one of the following holds true:*

*(i) $X_1 = X_2 + z$ for some $z \in \mathbb{F}_p$.*

*(ii) $\{X_1, X_2\} = \{r[x_1, x_1 + 2], r([x_2, x_2 + 1] \cup \{x_2 + 3\})\}$ for some $r, x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$.*

*Proof.* See [6, Lemma 27]. □

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let $x, y, x', y'$ be elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$, $r, r' \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ and $Y$ a subset of $[x', y']$. Call $R$ the element of $\{0, \ldots, p-1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $R = r^{-1}r'$. If $r[x, y] = r'([x', y'] \setminus Y)$, then*

$$|Y| + 1 \geq \min\big\{p - R, R, |[x, y]|\big\}.$$

*Furthermore, if $|[x, y]| \geq \min\{R, p - R\} =: k$, then*

$$|[x', y']| \geq \left[\frac{|[x, y]|}{k}\right] + (k - 1)\left[\frac{p}{k}\right].$$

*Proof.* For the first claim, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\big(r'[x',y'] \setminus Y) + r'\big) \setminus r'([x',y'] \setminus Y)\Big| &= \Big|\big(([x',y'] \setminus Y) + 1\big) \setminus ([x',y'] \setminus Y)\Big| \\ &\leq |Y| + 1.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\big(r[x,y] + r'\big) \setminus r[x,y]\Big| &= \Big|\big([x,y] + r^{-1}r'\big) \setminus [x,y]\Big| \\ &\geq \min\big\{p - R, R, |[x,y]|\big\}\end{aligned}$$

and these inequalities show the first claim.

For the second statement, assume without loss of generality that $k = R$. Let $k'$ be the element of $\{0,\dots,p-1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\overline{k'} = rr'^{-1}$. Then there is $s \in \{0,\dots,p-1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such $kk' = sp+1$. If $u \in \{1,\dots,\left[\frac{p}{k}\right]\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, then $\overline{(uk)k'} = \overline{u}$ since $\overline{kk'} = 1$. In particular, for all $i,j \in \{0,\dots,k-1\}$ and $z \in \mathbb{F}_p$, we have that $irr'^{-1}, jrr'^{-1} \in \left[z, z + \overline{\left[\frac{p}{k}\right]} - 1\right]$ only if $i = j$. This implies straightforward by the Pigeonhole principle that

$$\min\left\{\big|\big[x'',y''\big]\big| :\ rr'^{-1}[x,y] \subseteq \big[x'',y''\big]\right\} \geq \left[\frac{|[x,y]|}{k}\right] + (k-1)\left[\frac{p}{k}\right]$$

and the claim follows. □

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let $X$ be a subset of $\mathbb{F}_p$.*

*(i) Assume that $3 \leq |X| \leq p-5$ and $X = r([x,y]\setminus\{z\})$ for some $x,y,z,r \in \mathbb{F}_p$. If there are $x',y',z',r' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X = r'([x',y'] \setminus \{z'\})$, then $r' \in \{\pm r\}$.*

*(ii) Assume that $3 \leq |X| \leq p-5$ and $X = r([x,y]\setminus\{z,z'\})$ for some $x,y,r,z,z'$ $\in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $z \neq z'$ and $z,z' \in [x+1,y-1]$. If there are $x',y',r' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X = r'[x',y']$, then $|X| = 3$ and $r' \in \{\pm 2r\}$.*

*Proof.* We have that (i) is a consequence of [6, Lemma 16] up to some cases which are solved easily. Then (ii) is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 2.5. □

The following result is an application of Proposition 2.6.

**Corollary 2.7.** *Let $x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ be such that*

$$4 \leq |[x_2,y_2]| \leq p-5 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 0 \leq |[x_1,y_1]| - |[x_2,y_2]| \leq 2.$$

*If $r_1,r_2 \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^*$ satisfy that $r_2[x_2,y_2] \subseteq r_1[x_1,y_1]$, then $r_1 \in \{\pm r_2\}$.*

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_p$ be such that $\lambda^4 + \lambda^2 + 1 = 0$ and*

$$X := \{0,1,2,\lambda^2+1,\lambda^2+2,2\lambda^2+2\}.$$

*If $[y,y+2] \subseteq \lambda X$, then $p \leq 7$ or*

$$y = \begin{cases} 2\lambda & \text{if } \lambda^3 = 1 \\ 2\lambda - 2 & \text{if } \lambda^3 = -1. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* See [6, Lemma 29]. □

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n$ and $r$ be elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $[x_i, y_i] \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $r[x_i, y_i] \cap r[x_j - 1, y_j + 1] \neq \emptyset$ only if $i = j$. If $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p$ are such that $|[x, y]| \geq 2$ and $X := \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} r[x_i, y_i]$, then*

$$|X + r[x, y]| \geq \min\{p, |X| + |[x, y]| + n - 2\}.$$

*Proof.* First assume that for all $x', y' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $r[x', y'] \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p \setminus X$ we have $|[x, y]| > |[x', y']|$; then $X + r[x, y] = \mathbb{F}_p$ and this implies the claim. Now assume that there are $x', y' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $r[x', y'] \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p \setminus X$ and $|[x, y]| \leq |[x', y']|$; without loss of generality suppose that $x' = y_1 + 1$ and $y' = x_2 - 1$, and set $Y := \bigcup_{i=2}^{n} (r[x_i, y_i] + r[x, x + 1])$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |X + r[x, y]| &\geq |r[x_1 + x, y_1 + y]| + |Y| && \text{since } r[x', y'] \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p \setminus X \\ &= |r[x_1, y_1]| + |r[x, y]| - 1 + |Y| \\ &\geq |r[x_1, y_1]| + |[x, y]| - 1 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} (|r[x_i, y_i]| + 1) \\ &= |X| + |[x, y]| + n - 2. \end{aligned}$$

□

This lower bound of $|X + r[x, y]|$ will be used in the following result.

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ be such that*

$$3 \leq \min\{|[x_1, y_1]|, |[x_2, y_2]|\} \leq \max\{|[x_1, y_1]|, |[x_2, y_2]|\} \leq p - 6.$$

*If $r_1, r_2 \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^*$ satisfy the inequality*

$$|r_1[x_1, y_1] + r_2[x_2, y_2]| \leq |[x_1, y_1]| + |[x_2, y_2]| + 1, \tag{2.1}$$

*then one of the following statements holds true*

*(i)* $r_1 \in \{\pm r_2\}$.

*(ii)* $r_2 \in \{\pm 2r_1\}$ *and* $|[x_2, y_2]| = 3$.

*(iii)* $r_1 \in \{\pm 2r_2\}$ *and* $|[x_1, y_1]| = 3$.

*Furthermore, if (2.1) is strict, then $r_1 \in \{\pm r_2\}$.*

*Proof.* Write $S := r_1[x_1, y_1] + r_2[x_2, y_2]$. By Theorem 2.1 we have to work only with 3 cases:

If $|S| = |[x_1, y_1]| + |[x_2, y_2]| - 1$, then $r_1 \in \pm\{r_2\}$ by Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 2.6.

If $|S| = |[x_1, y_1]| + |[x_2, y_2]|$, then $r_2[x_2, y_2] = r_1[x_1^*, y_1^*] \cup r_1[x_1^{**}, y_1^{**}]$ by Proposition 2.9. Furthermore, since $|S| = |[x_1, y_1]| + |[x_2, y_2]|$, it can be seen that $r_2[x_2, y_2] = r_1([x_1', y_1'] \setminus \{z'\})$ for some $x_1', y_1' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ and $z' \in \left[x_1', y_1'\right]$; however, $r_2[x_2, y_2]$ cannot have this shape by Proposition 2.6.

If $|S| = |[x_1, y_1]| + |[x_2, y_2]| + 1$, then $r_2[x_2, y_2] = r_1[x_1^*, y_1^*] \cup r_1[x_1^{**}, y_1^{**}] \cup r_1[x_1^{***}, y_1^{***}]$ for some $x_1^*, y_1^*, x_1^{**}, y_1^{**}, x_1^{***}, y_1^{***} \in \mathbb{F}_p$ by Proposition 2.9. If $|[x_1, y_1]| > 3$, then $r_2[x_2, y_2] = r_1[x_1', y_1'] \setminus \{z, z'\}$ for some $x_1', y_1', z, z' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ with $z, z' \in [x_1' + 1, y_1' - 1]$ and $z \neq z'$. By Proposition 2.6 this means that $|r_2[x_2, y_2]| = 3$ and $r_2 \in \{\pm 2r_1\}$. If $|[x_1, y_1]| = 3$ and $|[x_2, y_2]| > 3$, then we proceed as above. Hence it remains the case $|[x_1, y_1]| = |[x_2, y_2]| = 3$; under this assumption, $r_2[x_2, y_2]$ is as above or $r_2[x_2, y_2] = r_1[x_1', y_1'] \cup r_1[x_1'', y_1'']$ with $r_1[x_1', y_1'] \cap r_1[x_1'' - 2, y_1'' + 2] = \emptyset$ and it is straightforward to check that $r_1, r_2$ are as in (ii) or (iii).

The second claim is proven above. □

**Lemma 2.11.** *Assume that $p \geq 5$. Let $X$ be a subset of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $|X| = 3$ and $w \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that*

$$X + X + w = -(X + X + w). \tag{2.2}$$

*Then there is $r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X = r[-1, 1] - 2^{-1}w$. In particular, $|X + X + w| = |X| + |X| - 1$.*

*Proof.* Write $X' := X + 2^{-1}w = \{x', y', z'\}$ so (2.2) is equivalent to

$$X' + X' = -(X' + X');$$

in particular

$$\sum_{w' \in X' + X'} w' = \sum_{w' \in X' + X'} -w' = \sum_{-w' \in X' + X'} w'$$

so $x' + y' + z' = 0$ and $X' + X' = \{2x', 2y', x' + y', -y', -x', -2x' - 2y'\}$. Since $2x' \in -(X' + X')$, we conclude that $X' = r[-1, 1]$ for some $r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ analyzing all the possible values of $2x'$. □

## 3. Case $n = 2$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let $X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be disjoint subsets such that $|X_1| = |X_2| = 3$ and $|X_1| + |X_2| \leq p - 5$. If $a_1, a_2$ are elements in $\mathbb{F}_p{}^*$ such that $a_1 \neq a_2$*

$$|a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1| \leq |X_1| + |X_2|,$$

*then $a_1 = -a_2$ and there exist $x, y, c, r, z \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that*

$$\{X_1, X_2\} = \left\{r[x, y], r([y + c, x - c] \setminus \{z\})\right\}.$$

*Proof.* Write $S := a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1$. If $|a_1X_1 + a_2X_2| = |X_1| + |X_2| - 1$, then $a_1X_1 = r[x_1, x_1 + 2]$ and $a_2X_2 = r[x_2, x_2 + 2]$ for some $r, x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ by Theorem 2.2. Thus $a_2X_1 = a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1, x_1 + 2]$ and $a_1X_2 = a_1a_2^{-1}r[x_2, x_2 + 2]$. On the other hand, the inequality

$$|a_1X_2 + a_2X_1| \leq |X_1| + |X_2|$$

implies that $a_2a_1^{-1} \in \{\pm a_1a_2^{-1}\}$ by Lemma 2.10. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} S \in \{&r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 4] \cup a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 4], \\ &r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 4] \cup a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1 - x_2 - 2, x_1 - x_2 + 2]\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Since $|S| \leq |X_1| + |X_2|$, there are $z' \in a_1X_1 + a_2X_2$ and $z'' \in a_2X_1 + a_1X_2$ such that

$$(a_1X_1 + a_2X_2) \setminus \{z'\} = (a_2X_1 + a_1X_2) \setminus \{z''\}.$$

Then (3.1) implies that $a_2a_1^{-1} = -1$ by Proposition 2.6. The equality $a_1 = -a_2$ and (3.1) yield that $x_1 + x_2 = -2$ and consequently $X_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$. If $|a_1X_2 + a_2X_1| = |X_1| + |X_2| - 1$, then we proceed as above so from now on we assume that

$$|a_1X_1 + a_2X_2| = |a_1X_2 + a_2X_1| = |X_1| + |X_2|. \tag{3.2}$$

By Proposition 2.4 we have the following cases:

Either there is not $w \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_1X_1 = a_2X_2 + w$ or there is not $w \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_2X_1 = a_1X_2 + w$. Assume without loss of generality that there is not $w \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_1X_1 = a_2X_2 + w$; from Proposition 2.4 we may assume that $a_1X_1 = r[x_1, x_1 + 2]$ and $a_2X_2 = r([x_2, x_2 + 1] \cup \{x_2 + 3\})$ for some $r, x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ (the other cases are solved in the same way). Hence $a_2X_1 = a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1, x_1 + 2]$, $a_1X_2 = a_1a_2^{-1}r([x_2, x_2 + 1] \cup \{x_2 + 3\})$, and therefore (3.2) tell us that $a_2a_1^{-1} \in \{\pm a_1a_2^{-1}\}$ by Proposition 2.4 and Proposition 2.6. Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} S \in \{&r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 5] \cup a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 5], \\ &r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 5] \cup a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1 - x_2 - 3, x_1 - x_2 + 2]\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

and, since $|S| \leq |X_1| + |X_2|$, we have that

$$r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 5] = a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 5]$$

or

$$r[x_1 + x_2, x_1 + x_2 + 5] = a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1 - x_2 - 3, x_1 - x_2 + 2];$$

in any case $a_2a_1^{-1} = -1$ by Proposition 2.6. The equality $a_1 = -a_2$ and (3.3) yield the solution.

Now we proceed in the case where there are $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_1X_1 = a_2X_2 + w_1$ and $a_2X_1 = a_1X_2 + w_2$. We have

$$a_2^2a_1^{-1}X_2 + a_2a_1^{-1}w_1 = a_2X_1 = a_1X_2 + w_2$$

so

$$a_2^2a_1^{-2}X_2 + a_2a_1^{-2}w_1 - a_1^{-1}w_2 = X_2.$$

Set $\lambda := a_2a_1^{-1}$ and $\mu := a_2a_1^{-2}w_1 - a_1^{-1}w_2$ so $X_2 = \lambda^2X_2 + \mu$. If $\lambda = -1$, then $\mu = 0$ and thereby $a_1 + a_2 = w_1 + w_2 = 0$; however, this is impossible since (3.2) would contradict Lemma 2.11. From now on suppose that $\lambda^2 \neq 1$. If $\lambda^2 = -1$, then $X_2$ is an arithmetic progression since $|X_2| = 3$; consequently $a_1X_2$ and $a_2X_1$ are arithmetic progressions with the same difference and hence

$$|a_1X_2 + a_2X_1| = |X_1| + |X_2| - 1$$

contradicting (3.2). From now on suppose that $\lambda^2 \neq -1$ and write $X_2 := \{x_2, y_2, z_2\}$. If $\lambda^2w + \mu = w$ for some $w \in X_2$, then for all $w' \in X_2 \setminus \{w\}$

$$\lambda^2w' + \mu \neq w'; \tag{3.4}$$

however, since $|X_2| = 3$, we get that

$$\lambda^4w' + (\lambda^2 + 1)\mu = w'. \tag{3.5}$$

Thus (3.5) implies that (3.4) is false insomuch as $\lambda^2 + 1 \neq 0$. Then without loss of generality $y_2 = \lambda^2x_2 + \mu$, $z_2 = \lambda^2y_2 + \mu$ and $x_2 = \lambda^2z_2 + \mu$; particularly $1 + \lambda^2 + \lambda^4 = 0$. From (3.2) we see that $a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 = a_2X_1 + a_1X_2$ so

$$a_2a_1^{-1}X_2 + a_2a_1^{-1}X_2 = X_2 + X_2 - (w_1 - w_2)a_1^{-1}. \tag{3.6}$$

Adding $-2x_2\lambda$ and multiplying (3.6) by $\theta := ((\lambda^2 - 1)x_2 + \mu)^{-1}$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda\{0, 1, 2, \lambda^2 + 1, \lambda^2 + 2, 2\lambda^2 + 2\} = \{0, 1, 2, \lambda^2 + 1, \lambda^2 + 2, 2\lambda^2 + 2\} \\ + ((w_2 - w_1)a_1^{-1} + 2x_2(1 - \lambda))\theta.\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

By Lemma 2.8 we conclude that

$$\lambda^3 = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 2\lambda = ((w_2 - w_1)a_1^{-1} + 2x_2(1 - \lambda))\theta \tag{3.8}$$

or

$$\lambda^3 = -1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad 2\lambda - 2 = ((w_2 - w_1)a_1^{-1} + 2x_2(1 - \lambda))\theta. \tag{3.9}$$

If (3.8) is true, then $2\lambda\mu = (w_2 - w_1)a_1^{-1}$ and thereby

$$w_2(1 + 2\lambda) = w_1(1 + 2\lambda^2); \tag{3.10}$$

on the other hand

$$X_2 = \lambda^2X_2 + \mu = \lambda^4X_2 + (\lambda^2 + 1)\mu = \lambda X_2 + (\lambda^2 + 1)\mu$$

and by assumption $X_1 = \lambda X_2 + a_1^{-1}w_1$; however, we get from (3.10) that $(\lambda^2 + 1)\mu = a_1^{-1}w_1$ contradicting the disjointedness of $X_1$ and $X_2$. If (3.9) is true, then (3.7) implies that $\{0, \lambda, \lambda - 1\} = \{3\lambda - 2, 3\lambda - 1, 4\lambda - 2\}$ which is impossible.

□

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let $X_1, X_2 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be disjoint subsets such that* $\min\{|X_1|, |X_2|\} \geq 3$. *If*

$$|X_1 - X_2 \cup X_2 - X_1| \leq |X_1| + |X_2| \leq p - 4,$$

*then* $\{X_1, X_2\} = \big\{r[x, y], r([y + c, x - c] \setminus \{z\})\big\}$ *for some* $x, y, c, r, z \in \mathbb{F}_p$.

*Proof.* Write $S := X_1 - X_2 \cup X_2 - X_1$. By Lemma 3.1 we may assume that $\max\{|X_1|, |X_2|\} > 3$ from now on. By Theorem 2.1

$$|X_1| + |X_2| - 1 \leq \min\{|X_1 - X_2|, |X_2 - X_1|\}$$

so $|X_1| + |X_2| - 1 \leq |S|$. If $|X_1| + |X_2| - 1 = |S|$, then $S = X_1 - X_2 = X_2 - X_1$. In the case where $|X_1| + |X_2| - 1 = |X_1 - X_2|$ Theorem 2.2 establishes that there exist $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_1 = r[x_1, y_1]$ and $X_2 = r[x_2, y_2]$. Hence $X_1 - X_2 = X_2 - X_1$ if and only if there is $c \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_1 = r[x_1, y_1]$ and $X_2 = r[y_1 + c, x_1 - c]$. We suppose that $|X_1| + |X_2| = |S|$ from now on and we have to study two cases:

Assume that $|X_1| + |X_2| - 1 \notin \{|X_1 - X_2|, |X_2 - X_1|\}$. We know that $7 \leq |X_1| + |X_2|$. On one hand $|X_1 - X_2| = |X_1| + |X_2|$, and by Theorem 2.3 there are $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_1 \subseteq r[x_1, y_1]$ and $X_2 \subseteq r[x_2, y_2]$ with $|X_1| + 1 = |[x_1, y_1]|$ and $|X_2| + 1 = |[x_2, y_2]|$. On the other hand $|X_2 - X_1| = |X_1| + |X_2|$, and by Theorem 2.3 there are $x_1', x_2', y_1', y_2', r' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_1 \subseteq r'[x_1', y_1']$ and $X_2 \subseteq r'[x_2', y_2']$ with $|X_1| + 1 = |[x_1', y_1']|$ and $|X_2| + 1 = |[x_2', y_2']|$. By Proposition 2.6 $r \in \{\pm r'\}$; assume without loss of generality that $r = r'$. Hence $|(X_1 - X_2) \cup (X_2 - X_1)| = |X_1| + |X_2|$ if and only if there are $x, y, c, z \in \mathbb{F}_p$ with $z \in [y + c, x - c]$ such that $\{X_1, X_2\} = \{r[x, y], r([y + c, x - c] \setminus \{z\})\}$.

For the remaining case, assume without loss of generality that $|X_1| + |X_2| - 1 = |X_1 - X_2|$. By Theorem 2.2 there are $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_1 = r[x_1, y_1]$ and $X_2 = r[x_2, y_2]$. Inasmuch as $|S| = |X_1| + |X_2|$, we conclude that $X_1 - X_2 \neq X_2 - X_1$, and furthermore

$$|X_1 - X_2 \cap X_2 - X_1| = |X_1| + |X_2| - 1. \tag{3.11}$$

Finally, (3.11) let us state that there are $x, y, c \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that

$$\{X_1, X_2\} = \{r[x, y], r[y + c, x - c - 1]\}.$$

□

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let $X_1$ and $X_2$ be disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that* $\min\{|X_1|, |X_2|\} \geq 3$ *and $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p{}^*$ with $a_1 \notin \{\pm a_2\}$. If $|X_1| + |X_2| \leq p - 5$ , then*

$$|a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1| > |X_1| + |X_2|.$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 3.1 we may assume that $\max\{|X_1|, |X_2|\} > 3$ from now on. Set $S := a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1$. We assume that the lemma is false and we obtain a contradiction. By Theorem 2.1

$$|X_1| + |X_2| - 1 \leq |a_1X_1 + a_2X_2|, |a_2X_1 + a_1X_2| \leq |X_1| + |X_2|.$$

Thus Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3 imply the existence of $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, r \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_1X_1 \subseteq r[x_1, y_1]$ and $a_2X_2 \subseteq r[x_2, y_2]$ with $|[x_1, y_1]| = |X_1| + 1$ and $|[x_2, y_2]| = |X_2| + 1$. In the same way, there are $x_1', x_2', y_1', y_2', r' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_2X_1 \subseteq r'[x_1', y_1']$ and $a_1X_2 \subseteq r'[x_2', y_2']$ with $|[x_1', y_1']| = |X_1| + 1$ and $|[x_2', y_2']| = |X_2| + 1$. Since $a_2X_1 = a_2a_1^{-1}(a_1X_1) \subseteq a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_1, y_1]$, we get that $a_2a_1^{-1}r \in \{\pm r'\}$ by Proposition 2.6. Thus there are $x_3, y_3, x_3', y_3' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \subseteq r[x_3, y_3]$ and $a_2X_1 + a_1X_2 \subseteq a_2a_1^{-1}r[x_3', y_3']$ with $|[x_3, y_3]| = |[x_3', y_3']| = |X_1| + |Y_1|$. Then Proposition 2.6 and Corollary 2.7 yield $r \in \{\pm a_2a_1^{-1}r\}$ contradicting the assumption $a_1 \notin \{\pm a_2\}$. □

## 4. Case $n = 3$

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let $X_1, X_2, X_3$ be pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\min_{1\leq i\leq 3} |X_i| \geq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^3 |X_i| \leq p - 3$. Assume that $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{F}_p{}^*$ are such that there exist $a_i, a_j$ with $a_i \notin \{\pm a_j\}$. Then*

$$\left| \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_3} \sum_{i=1}^3 a_{\sigma(i)}X_i \right| > \sum_{i=1}^3 |X_i|.$$

*Proof.* Assume without loss of generality that $a_1 \notin \{\pm a_2\}$ and set $S := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_3} \sum_{i=1}^3 a_{\sigma(i)}X_i$. We assume that $|S| \leq |X_1| + |X_2| + |X_3|$, and we arrive to a contradiction. By Lemma 3.3

$$|a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1| > |X_1| + |X_2|.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^3 |X_i| &\leq |(a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1)| + |a_3X_3| - 1 \\
&\leq |(a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1) + a_3X_3| \qquad \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\
&= |a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + a_3X_3 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1 + a_3X_3| \\
&\leq |S|;
\end{aligned}$$

particularly

$$|S| = |(a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1) + a_3X_3| = |X_1| + |X_2| + |X_3|. \tag{4.1}$$

From Theorem 2.2 and (4.1), there exist $x_3, y_3, x_3', y_3', r_3 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that

$$a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_2X_1 = r_3[x_3', y_3'] \qquad \text{and} \qquad a_3X_3 = r_3[x_3, y_3]. \tag{4.2}$$

In the same way, there are $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_3X_2 = r_2[x_2, y_2]$ and $a_3X_1 = r_1[x_1, y_1]$. Then

$$a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 = a_1a_3^{-1}r_1[x_1, y_1] + a_2a_3^{-1}r_2[x_2, y_2]$$

and

$$a_2X_1 + a_1X_2 = a_2a_3^{-1}r_1[x_1, y_1] + a_1a_3^{-1}r_2[x_2, y_2]$$

so, by Lemma 2.10 and (4.1), we have the following cases:

If $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm a_2a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ and $a_2a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm a_1a_3^{-1}r_2\}$, then there are $z_1, z_2$, $z_1', z_2' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 = a_1a_3^{-1}r_1[z_1, z_2]$ and $a_2X_1 + a_1X_2 = a_2a_3^{-1}r_1[z_1', z_2']$. By Corollary 2.7 and (4.2), $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1, a_2a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm r_3\}$ so $a_1 \in \{\pm a_2\}$ contradicting the hypothesis.

If $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm a_2a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ and $a_2a_3^{-1}r_1 \notin \{\pm a_1a_3^{-1}r_2\}$, then either $a_2a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm 2a_1a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ or $a_1a_3^{-1}r_2 \in \{\pm 2a_2a_3^{-1}r_1\}$. It will be assumed without loss of generality that $a_2a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm 2a_1a_3^{-1}r_2\}$. Hence there are $z_1, z_2, z_1', z_2' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 = a_2a_3^{-1}r_2[z_1, z_2]$ and $a_2X_1 + a_1X_2 = a_1a_3^{-1}r_2[z_1', z_2']$. From Corollary 2.7 and (4.2), $a_2a_3^{-1}r_2, a_1a_3^{-1}r_2 \in \{\pm r_3\}$ so $a_1 \in \{\pm a_2\}$ which contradicts the assumption. The case $a_2a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm a_1a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ and $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1 \notin \{\pm a_2a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ is solved in the same way.

Assume that $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1 \notin \{\pm a_2a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ and $a_2a_3^{-1}r_1 \notin \{\pm a_1a_3^{-1}r_2\}$. Lemma 2.10 establishes that $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm 2a_2a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ or $a_2a_3^{-1}r_2 \in \{\pm 2a_1a_3^{-1}r_1\}$, and $a_2a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm 2a_1a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ or $a_1a_3^{-1}r_2 \in \{\pm 2a_2a_3^{-1}r_1\}$. In some of the cases, we arrive to a contradiction proceeding exactly as above. Up to symmetric cases, the unique possibility remaining is $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1 \in \{\pm 2a_2a_3^{-1}r_2\}$ and $a_1a_3^{-1}r_2 \in \{\pm 2a_2a_3^{-1}r_1\}$ with $[x_1, x_1 + 2] = [x_1, y_1]$ and $[x_2, x_2 + 2] = [x_2, y_2]$. Suppose without loss of generality that $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1 = 2a_2a_3^{-1}r_2$. If $a_1a_3^{-1}r_2 = 2a_2a_3^{-1}r_1$, then

$$a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 = a_2a_3^{-1}r_2[2x_1 + x_2, 2x_1 + x_2 + 6]$$

and

$$a_2X_1 + a_1X_2 = a_2a_3^{-1}r_1[x_1 + 2x_2, x_1 + 2x_2 + 6]$$

so Corollary 2.7 and (4.2) establish that $r_1 \in \{\pm r_2\}$; moreover, (4.2) leads to

$$a_2a_3^{-1}r_2[2x_1 + x_2, 2x_1 + x_2 + 6] = a_2a_3^{-1}r_1[x_1 + 2x_2, x_1 + 2x_2 + 6]$$

and therefore $X_1 \cap X_2 \neq \emptyset$ which is impossible. If $a_1a_3^{-1}r_2 = -2a_2a_3^{-1}r_1$, then

$$a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 = a_2a_3^{-1}r_2[2x_1 + x_2, 2x_1 + x_2 + 6]$$

and

$$a_2X_1 + a_1X_2 = a_2a_3^{-1}r_1[x_1 - 2x_2 - 4, x_1 - 2x_2 + 2].$$

As above

$$a_2a_3^{-1}r_2[2x_1+x_2,2x_1+x_2+6]=a_2a_3^{-1}r_1[x_1-2x_2-4,x_1-2x_2+2]$$

so $r_1\in\{\pm r_2\}$ by Proposition 2.6; however, this contradicts the equalities $a_1a_3^{-1}r_1=2a_2a_3^{-1}r_2$ and $a_1a_3^{-1}r_2=-2a_2a_3^{-1}r_1$.

□

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let $X_1$ and $X_2$ be disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $\min\{|X_1|,|X_2|\}\geq 3$ and $|X_1|+|X_2|\leq p-4$. If there are $x_1,y_1,r\in\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_1=r[x_1,y_1]$ and*

$$|X_1-X_2\cup X_2-X_1|\leq |X_1|+|X_2|+1, \tag{4.3}$$

*then one of the following statements hold true:*

*(i) There are $c,z,z'\in\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_2=r\big([y_1+c,x_1-c]\setminus\{z,z'\}\big)$.*

*(ii) There are $x_2,y_2\in\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_2=r\big([x_2,y_2]\cup[x_1+y_1-y_2,x_1+y_1-x_2]\big)$ and $|X_1|=3$.*

*Proof.* Write $S:=X_1-X_2\cup X_2-X_1$. By Proposition 2.9 and (4.3), there are $x_2,x_3,x_4,y_2,y_3,y_4\in\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_2=\bigcup_{i=2}^4 r[x_i,y_i]$ and $[x_i,y_i]\cap[x_j-1,y_j+1]=\emptyset$ for all $i\neq j$. Suppose without loss of generality that $[x_2,y_2]\neq\emptyset$. If $[x_3,y_3]=[x_4,y_4]=\emptyset$ or $\emptyset\notin\{[x_3,y_3],[x_4,y_4]\}$, then (i) is implied by (4.3). If $\{\emptyset\}\subsetneq\{[x_3,y_3],[x_4,y_4]\}$, then it is checked straightforward that $X_1$ and $X_2$ need to be as in (i) or (ii). □

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let $X_1,X_2,X_3$ be pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\min\{|X_1|,|X_2|,|X_3|\}\geq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^3|X_i|\leq p-3$. Then*

$$\left|\bigcup_{\{i,j,k\}=\{1,2,3\}}X_i+X_j-X_k\right|>\sum_{i=1}^3|X_i|.$$

*Proof.* Write $S:=\bigcup_{\{i,j,k\}=\{1,2,3\}}X_i+X_j-X_k$. We suppose that $|S|\leq\sum_{i=1}^3|X_i|$ and we shall arrive to a contradiction. Write $S_i:=X_j-X_k\cup X_k-X_j$ for all $\{i,j,k\}=\{1,2,3\}$. Then

$$|S_i|+|X_i|-1\leq|S_i+X_i|\leq|S|\leq\sum_{j=1}^3|X_j|\qquad\forall\, i\in\{1,2,3\}. \tag{4.4}$$

We claim that there are $r,x,y\in\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $r[x,y]\in\{X_1,X_2,X_3\}$. Indeed, if $|S_1|\leq|X_2|+|X_3|$, the claim follows from Lemma 3.2. If $|S_1|>|X_2|+|X_3|$, then Theorem 2.2 and (4.4) imply that $X_1=r[x,y]$ for some $r,x,y\in\mathbb{F}_p$. We assume without loss of generality that $X_1=r[x_1,y_1]$ for some $r,x_1,y_1\in\mathbb{F}_p$. Now we may apply Lemma 4.2 to $S_2$ and $S_3$ by (4.4); finally, it is easy to see that if $X_2$ and $X_3$ are as in (i) or (ii) of Lemma 4.2, then $X_1$, $X_2$ and $X_3$ are not pairwise disjoint or $|S_1|>|X_2|+|X_3|+1$. □

## 5. Special cases with $n > 3$

**Lemma 5.1.** *Assume that $n \geq 2$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n, a$ be elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that $[x_1, y_1], \ldots, [x_n, y_n]$ are pairwise disjoint, $3 \leq \min_{1\leq i\leq n} |[x_i, y_i]|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n |[x_i, y_i]| \leq p-1$. Write*

$$S := \left\{ az_i + \sum_{j=1, i\neq j}^{n} x_j : \ i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, z_i \in [x_i, y_i] \right\}.$$

*If $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p$ satisfy that $S \subseteq [x, y]$ and $a \notin \{0, \pm 1\}$, then*

$$|[x, y]| > \max_{1\leq i\leq n} |[x_i, y_i]| + n - 2. \tag{5.1}$$

*Proof.* Set $I := [x, y]$ and $M := \max_{1\leq i\leq n} |[x_i, y_i]|$. We assume that there exist $x$ and $y$ such that (5.1) is not true, and we arrive to a contradiction.

First we show that $M \leq n-1$. Indeed, suppose without loss of generality that $M = |[x_1, y_1]|$; then

$$a[x_1, y_1] \subseteq S - \sum_{j=2}^{n} x_j \subseteq I - \sum_{j=2}^{n} x_j. \tag{5.2}$$

Let $R$ be the element of $\{0, \ldots, p-1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\overline{R} = a$ and we assume without loss of generality that $R < p - R$. Applying Lemma 2.5 to (5.2), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} n - 1 &\geq |I| - M + 1 \\ &= \left| \left( I - \sum_{j=2}^{n} x_j \right) \setminus a[x_1, y_1] \right| + 1 \\ &\geq \min\{R, M\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

On one hand the assumptions $3 \leq \min_{1\leq i\leq n} |[x_i, y_i]|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n |[x_i, y_i]| \leq p-1$ yield

$$M + 3(n-1) \leq p. \tag{5.4}$$

On the other hand if $M > n-1$, then $M \geq R$ by (5.3). Hence Lemma 2.5 leads to the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} M + n - 2 &\geq |I| \\ &\geq \left\lceil \frac{M}{R} \right\rceil + (R-1) \left\lceil \frac{p}{R} \right\rceil \\ &> \frac{M-R}{R} + (R-1) \left( \frac{p-R}{R} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and consequently

$$M + (n-1) \left( \frac{R}{R-1} \right) + R > p. \tag{5.5}$$

Inasmuch as $R \geq 2$ (5.5) and (5.4) contradict (5.3) and therefore $M \leq n-1$.

Define

$$S' := \left\{ ax_i + (a-1)\delta + \sum_{j=1, i\neq j}^{n} x_j : \ i \in \{1,\dots,n\}, \delta \in \{0,1\} \right\};$$

As $x_i \in \{x_j - 1, x_j, x_j + 1\}$ implies that $i = j$, we conclude that $|S'| = 2n$. See that $ax_i + a + \sum_{j=1, i\neq j}^{n} x_j \in I$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$; then, since $I$ is an interval, we have that $ax_i + (a-1) + \sum_{j=1, i\neq j}^{n} x_j \in I$ for all $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ except at most one element. In particular

$$|S' \cap I| \geq 2n - 1. \tag{5.6}$$

We already know that $M \leq n-1$; then we obtain the following contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} 2n-1 &\leq |S' \cap I| && \text{by (5.6)} \\ &\leq |I| \\ &\leq M + n - 2 \\ &\leq 2n - 3. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let $n \geq 2$ and $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $\min_{1\leq i\leq n} |X_i| \geq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| \leq p-5$. For $a \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^* \setminus \{\pm 1\}$*

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \left( aX_i + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} X_j \right) \right| > \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i|. \tag{5.7}$$

*Proof.* We prove it by induction on $n$. If $n \in \{2, 3\}$, then the result follows by Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.1. We assume that $n \geq 4$ and the result is true for all $m \leq n-1$. Write $S := \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \left( aX_i + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} X_j \right)$ and

$$S_k := \bigcup_{i=1, i\neq k}^{n} \left( aX_i + \sum_{j=1, j\notin\{k,i\}}^{n} X_j \right) \qquad \forall k \in \{1,\dots,n\}.$$

We suppose that (5.7) is not true and we shall get a contradiction. For each $k \in \{1,\dots,n\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| &\leq |S_k| + |X_k| - 1 && \text{by induction hypothesis} \\ &\leq |S_k + X_k| && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &= \left| \bigcup_{i=1, i\neq k}^{n} \left( aX_i + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} X_j \right) \right| \\ &\leq |S| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| && (5.8) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore all the inequalities of (5.8) are equalities. In particular, for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, there are $x_k, y_k, x'_k, y'_k, r_k \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_k = r_k[x_k, y_k]$ and $S_k = r_k[x'_k, y'_k]$ by Theorem 2.2. For all $k, k' \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ with $k < k'$, define

$$S_{k,k'} := \bigcup_{i=1, i \notin \{k,k'\}}^{n} \left( aX_i + \sum_{j=1, j \notin \{k,k',i\}}^{n} X_j \right).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| \right) - 1 &\leq |S_{k,k'}| + |X_k| + |X_{k'}| - 2 && \text{by induction hypothesis} \\
&\leq |S_{k,k'} + X_k + X_{k'}| && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\
&= \left| \bigcup_{i=1, i \notin \{k,k'\}}^{n} \left( aX_i + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{n} X_j \right) \right| \\
&\leq |S| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i|
\end{aligned}$$

and in particular $|X_k + X_{k'}| \leq |X_k| + |X_{k'}|$; then Lemma 2.10 yields that $r_k \in \{\pm r_{k'}\}$. As a consequence, we may assume without loss of generality that $r_k = 1$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. For each $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $z \in [x_k, y_k]$, define $S_z^{(k)} := az + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{n} X_i$, $x_z^{(k)} := az + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{n} x_i$ and $y_z^{(k)} := az + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{n} y_i$; thus $S_z^{(k)} = \left[ x_z^{(k)}, y_z^{(k)} \right]$ and

$$|S_z^{(k)}| = \left| az + \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{n} X_i \right| = \left( \sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{n} |X_i| \right) - (n-2). \tag{5.9}$$

However, by Lemma 5.1, if $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p$ are chosen such that

$$\left\{ x_z^{(k)} : \ k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, \ z \in [x_k, y_k] \right\} \subseteq [x, y],$$

then $|[x, y]| > n - 2 + \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |X_k|$. Finally assume without loss of generality that $|X_1| = \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |X_k|$. By the above argumentation

$$\begin{aligned}
|S| &= \left| \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq n, \ z \in [x_k, y_k]} S_z^{(k)} \right| \\
&> n - 2 + |X_1| + \left( \left( \sum_{i=2}^{n} |X_i| \right) - (n-2) \right) && \text{by (5.9)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i|
\end{aligned}$$

and this contradicts our assumption. □

**Remark 5.3.** *If $n \geq 3$ in Lemma 5.2, then the assumption $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| \leq p-3$ can be weakened to $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| \leq p-3$ since the former assumption is just used in the small cases $n = 2$.*

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let $n \geq 3$ and $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $\min_{1\leq i\leq n} |X_i| \geq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| \leq p-3$. Then*

$$\left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \left( -X_i + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} X_j \right) \right| > \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i|. \tag{5.10}$$

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on $n$. If $n = 3$, then this is Lemma 4.3. From now on, $n \geq 4$ and the result is true for $m \in \{3, \ldots, n-1\}$. Write

$$S := \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \left( -X_i + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} X_j \right)$$

and

$$S_k := \bigcup_{i=1, i\neq k}^{n} \left( -X_i + \sum_{j=1, j\notin\{i,k\}}^{n} X_j \right) \qquad \forall\, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

Assume that (5.10) is false, and we shall arrive to a contradiction. See that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |S_k + X_k| \\ &\geq |S_k| + |X_k| - 1 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| && \text{by induction hypothesis} \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

so in (5.11) we have only equalities. Then, from Theorem 2.2, there are $r_k, x_k, y_k$, $r'_k, x'_k, y'_k \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_k = r_k[x_k, y_k]$ and $S_k = r_k[x'_k, y'_k]$ for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Now we show that if $n = 4$, then $r_i \in \{\pm r_j\}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$. Indeed, assume without loss of generality that $r_1 \notin \{\pm r_2\}$ and write $S_{1,2} := X_1 - X_2 \cup X_2 - X_1$ so

$$|S_{1,2}| \geq |r_1[x_1, y_1] - r_2[x_2, y_2]| > |X_1| + |X_2| \tag{5.12}$$

by Lemma 2.10. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |S_{1,2} + X_3 + X_4| \\ &\geq |S_{1,2}| + |X_3| + |X_4| - 2 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| - 1 && \text{by (5.12)}, \end{aligned}$$

and consequently $|X_3| + |X_4| \leq |X_3 + X_4|$; thus $r_3 \in \{\pm r_4\}$ by Lemma 2.10. We have that either $r_3 \notin \{\pm r_2\}$ or $r_3 \notin \{\pm r_1\}$; assume without loss of generality that $r_3 \notin \{\pm r_1\}$, then proceeding as above $r_2 \in \{\pm r_4\}$. Thus for all $\{i, j, k\} = \{2, 3, 4\}$ there are $z_k, w_k \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_i + X_j - X_k := r_2[z_k, w_k]$ and

$$|[z_2, w_2]| = |[z_3, w_3]| = |[z_4, w_4]| = \left( \sum_{i=2}^{4} |X_i| \right) - 2. \tag{5.13}$$

One one hand $|S_1| = 1 + \sum_{i=2}^{4} |X_i|$ by (5.11); from (5.13) and the assumption $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} |X_i| \geq 3$, there are $z_1, w_1 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $S_1 = r_2[z_1, w_1]$. On the other hand $S_1 = r_1[x_1', y_1']$ so the assumption $r_1 \notin \{\pm r_2\}$ contradicts Proposition 2.6.

We show that $r_i \in \{\pm r_j\}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ whether $n > 4$. Call

$$S_{k,k'} := \bigcup_{i=1, i \notin \{k,k'\}}^{n} \left( -X_i + \sum_{j=1, j \notin \{k,k',i\}}^{n} X_j \right) \qquad \forall\, k, k' \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ with } k < k';$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| \right) - 1 &\leq |S_{k,k'}| + |X_k| + |X_{k'}| - 2 && \text{by induction hypothesis} \\
&\leq |S_{k,k'} + X_k + X_{k'}| && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\
&= \left| \bigcup_{i=1, i \notin \{k,k'\}}^{n} \left( -X_i + \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{n} X_j \right) \right| \\
&\leq |S| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i|
\end{aligned}$$

and in particular $|X_k + X_{k'}| \leq |X_k| + |X_{k'}|$; then $r_k \in \{\pm r_{k'}\}$ by Lemma 2.10.

We assume without loss of generality that $r_k = 1$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ from now on. Rearranging $x_1, \dots, x_n$, we may suppose that $[x_k, y_k] \subseteq [x_1, x_{k+1}]$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Set $S' := \left\{ -y_i + \sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^{n} x_k : \ i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\}$. If for some $i_0, j_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $i_0 \neq j_0$ we get

$$-y_{i_0} + \sum_{k=1, k \neq i_0}^{n} x_k = -y_{j_0} + \sum_{k=1, k \neq j_0}^{n} x_k,$$

then for all $k_0 \notin \{i_0, j_0\}$ and $\delta \in [-2, 2]$

$$-y_{k_0} + \sum_{k=1, k \neq k_0}^{n} x_k \neq \left( -y_{i_0} + \sum_{k=1, k \neq i_0}^{n} x_k \right) + \delta \tag{5.14}$$

insomuch as $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} |X_i| \geq 3$ and $X_1, \dots, X_n$ are pairwise disjoint.Call

$$S_1' := \left\{ -y_i + \sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^{n} x_k : \ \exists\, j \neq i \text{ such that } -y_i + \sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^{n} x_k = -y_j + \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^{n} x_k \right\}$$

and $S_2' := S' \setminus S_1'$. If $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_p$ are such that $S' \subseteq [x, y]$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |[x,y]| &\geq 3|S_1'| + |S_2'| && \text{by (5.14)} \\ &\geq 2|S_1'| + |S_2'| \\ &= n. \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

On the other hand

$$\left| -X_i + \sum_{k=1, k\neq i}^{n} X_k \right| = \left| \left[ -y_i + \sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{n} x_k, -x_i + \sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{n} y_k \right] \right| = \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n} |X_k| \right) - (n-1). \tag{5.16}$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{n} |X_k| &\geq |S| \\ &= \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \left( -X_i + \sum_{k=1,k\neq i}^{n} X_i \right) \right| \\ &\geq n + \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n} |X_k| \right) - (n-1) && \text{by (5.15) and (5.16)} \\ &= \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n} |X_k| \right) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

which is impossible. □

**Lemma 5.5.**

*(i) Let $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \{\pm 1\}$ be not all equal and $X_1, \ldots, X_4$ pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $\min_{1\leq i\leq 4} |X_i| \geq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| \leq p-4$. Then*

$$\left| \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_4} \sum_{i=1}^{4} a_{\sigma(i)} X_i \right| > \sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i|. \tag{5.17}$$

*(ii) Let $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5 \in \{\pm 1\}$ be not all equal and $X_1, \ldots, X_5$ pairwise disjoint subsets of $\mathbb{F}_p$ with $\min_{1\leq i\leq 5} |X_i| \geq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{5} |X_i| \leq p-4$. Then*

$$\left| \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_5} \sum_{i=1}^{5} a_{\sigma(i)} X_i \right| > \sum_{i=1}^{5} |X_i|. \tag{5.18}$$

*Proof.* To prove (i), it is enough to do the case $1 = a_1 = a_2 = -a_3 = -a_4$ by Lemma 5.4. We assume that (5.17) is false and we arrive to a contradiction. As in the first part of Lemma 5.4, we can reduce to the case $X_k = [x_k, y_k]$ with

$x_k, y_k \in \mathbb{F}_p$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$ (however, instead of using the induction step, we use Lemma 4.3). Write $S_{1,2} := X_1 - X_2 \cup X_2 - X_1$ so

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| &\geq \left| \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4} \sum_{i=1}^{4} a_{\sigma(i)} X_i \right| \\ &\geq |S_{1,2} + X_3 - X_4| \\ &\geq |S_{1,2}| + |X_3| + |X_4| - 2 \qquad \text{by Theorem 2.1;}\end{aligned}$$

then $|S_{1,2}| \leq |X_1|+|X_2|+2$ and thereby there are $b_2, c_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ with $c_2 \in [b_2-3, b_2+3]$ such that $X_2 = [y_1 + b_2, x_1 - c_2]$. In the same way, there are $b_3, b_4, c_3, c_4 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_3 = [y_1 + b_3, x_1 - c_3]$ and $X_4 = [y_1 + b_4, x_1 - c_4]$ with $c_3 \in [b_3 - 3, b_3 + 3]$ and $c_4 \in [b_4 - 3, b_4 + 3]$; this contradicts the pairwise disjointedness of $X_2, X_3$, and $X_4$.

To show (ii), it is enough to do the case $1 = a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = -a_4 = -a_5$ by Lemma 5.4. We assume that (5.18) is false and we get a contradiction. As in the first part of Lemma 5.4 (however instead of using the induction step, we use Lemma 5.5 (i)), we can reduce to the case $X_k = [x_k, y_k]$ with $x_k, y_k \in \mathbb{F}_p$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$. Call $S_{1,2} := X_1 - X_2 \cup X_2 - X_1$ and we deduce that $|S_{1,2}| \leq |X_1|+|X_2|+3$ with the same analysis as in (i). This means that there are $b_2', c_2' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_2 = [y_1 + b_2', x_1 - c_2']$ with $c_2' \in [b_2' - 4, b_2' + 4]$. In the same way, there are $b_3', b_4', b_5', c_3', c_4', c_5' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_i = [y_1 + b_i', x_1 - c_i']$ with $c_i' \in [b_i' - 4, b_i' + 4]$ for all $i \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. Then $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4$ and $X_5$ are not disjoint. □

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let $X_1, \dots, X_4 \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be pairwise disjoint subsets with $\min_{1 \leq i \leq 4} |X_i| \geq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| \leq p - 4$. If $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4$ are elements of $\mathbb{F}_p{}^*$ such that $a_1 = a_2 = -a_3$, then*

$$\left| \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4} \sum_{i=1}^{4} a_{\sigma(i)} X_i \right| > \sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i|. \tag{5.19}$$

*Proof.* From Lemma 5.5 we may assume that $a_4 \notin \{\pm a_1\}$. We arrive to a contradiction whether (5.19) is false. Write

$$S := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4} \sum_{i=1}^{4} a_{\sigma(i)} X_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_4 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_3} \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_{\sigma(i)} X_i.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |S_4 + a_4 X_4| \\ &\geq |S_4| + |X_4| - 1 \qquad \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| \qquad \text{by Lemma 4.3;}\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Thus all the relations in (5.20) are equalities. By Theorem 2.2 there are $r_4, x_4, y_4, x_4', y_4' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_4X_4 = r_4[x_4, y_4]$ and $S_4 = r_4[x_4', y_4']$. Analogously there are $r_i, x_i, y_i, x_i', y_i' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $a_4X_i = r_i[x_i, y_i]$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Call $S_{3,4} := a_3X_3 + a_4X_4 \cup a_3X_4 + a_4X_3$ and note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + S_{3,4}| \\ &\geq |X_1| + |X_2| + |S_{3,4}| - 2 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i|\right) - 1 && \text{by Lemma 3.3}\end{aligned}$$

thus $|X_1| + |X_2| \geq |a_1X_1 + a_2X_2|$, and $r_1 \in \{\pm r_2\}$ by Lemma 2.10. In the same way, it can be proven that $r_i \in \{\pm r_j\}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$. Assume without loss of generality that $r_i = a_4$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$ and call $S_{1,2}' := a_1X_1 + a_3X_2 \cup a_1X_2 + a_3X_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i| &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |S_{1,2}' + a_2X_3 + a_4X_4| \\ &\geq |S_{1,2}'| + |X_3| + |X_4| && \text{by Lemma 2.10} \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{4} |X_i|\right) - 1 && \text{by Theorem 2.1.} \qquad (5.21)\end{aligned}$$

Hence (5.21) states that $|S_{1,2}'| \leq |X_1| + |X_2| + 1$ and thereby there are $b_2, c_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_2 = [y_1 + b_2, x_1 - c_2]$ with $c_2 \in [b_2 - 2, b_2 + 2]$. Proceeding as above, there are $b_3, b_4, c_3, c_4 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $X_3 = [y_1 + b_3, x_1 - c_3]$ and $X_4 = [y_1 + b_4, x_1 - c_4]$ with $c_3 \in [b_3 - 2, b_3 + 2]$ and $c_4 \in [b_4 - 2, b_4 + 2]$; thus $X_1, X_2, X_3$ and $X_4$ are not pairwise disjoint. □

## 6. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. Assume without loss of generality that the $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are ordered such that there exist $1 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \ldots < k_m = n$ with $a_1 = a_2 = \ldots = a_{k_1}$, $a_{k_i+1} = a_{k_i+2} = \ldots = a_{k_{i+1}}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$ and with $a_{k_i} = a_{k_j}$ only if $i = j$.

*Proof. (Theorem 1.1)* The proof is by induction on $n$. The result follows from Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3 when $n = 2$. Also the result follows from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.3 when $n = 3$. From now on $n \geq 4$ and we assume that the result is true for all $n' \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\}$. The induction step depends on $m$ and we analyze the following cases:

Suppose that $m \geq 4$. Then we can find a partition $A_1 \cup A_2$ of $\{a_{k_1}, \ldots, a_{k_m}\}$ such that $\min\{|A_1|, |A_2|\} > 1$ and there are $b_i, c_i \in A_i$ such that $b_i \notin \{\pm c_i\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Assume without loss of generality that $A_1 = \{a_{k_1}, a_{k_2}\}$ and $A_2 = \{a_{k_3}, \ldots, a_{k_m}\}$. Set

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_2}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} a_{\sigma(i)} X_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{n-k_2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_2} a_{\sigma(i)+k_2} X_{i+k_2};$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} |S| &\geq |S_1 + S_2| \\ &\geq |S_1| + |S_2| - 1 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} |X_i| \right) + 1 + \left( \sum_{i=k_2+1}^{n} |X_i| \right) + 1 - 1 && \text{by induction} \\ &> \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} |X_i| \right). && (6.1) \end{aligned}$$

Until the end of the proof, we assume without loss of generality that $k_1 \geq k_2 - k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_m - k_{m-1}$.

Suppose that $m = 3$. First we deal with the case $a_{k_1} \neq -a_{k_2}$. Write

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)} X_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1} X_{i+k_1}$$

and we conclude as in (6.1). Now assume that $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$ and $k_2 - k_1 > 1$. In this case we set

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_2 + 1 \\ a_{k_2+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)} X_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1} X_{i+k_1},$$

and we proceed as in (6.1). If $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$ and $k_2 - k_1 = 1$, then $k_3 - k_2 = 1$ since $k_3 - k_2 \leq k_2 - k_1$. Insomuch as $n \geq 4$, we get that $k_1 \geq 2$; moreover, we may assume that $k_1 > 2$ by Lemma 5.6. Defining

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)}X_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1}X_{i+k_1},$$

we obtain the result concluding as in (6.1).

Suppose that $m = 2$. By Lemma 5.2 and Lemma 5.4, it suffices to solve the case $k_2 - k_1 > 1$. If $a_{k_1} \neq -a_{k_2}$, then define

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)}X_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1}X_{i+k_1},$$

and we finish as in (6.1). If $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$ and $k_2 - k_1 = 2$, then $k_1 \geq 2$. By Lemma 5.5, it is enough to demonstrate the claim when $k_1 \geq 4$. We may conclude as in (6.1) defining

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 - 1 \\ a_{k_1-1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{k_1-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1-1} a'_{\sigma(i)}X_i \quad \text{and} \quad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{n-k_1+1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1+1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1-1}X_{i+k_1-1}.$$

Finally, if $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$ and $k_2 - k_1 > 2$, then define

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)}X_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1}X_{i+k_1},$$

and the result follows as in (6.1).

□

## 7. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section we show Theorem 1.2. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, assume without loss of generality that there are $1 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \ldots < k_m = n$ such that $a_1 = a_2 = \ldots = a_{k_1}$ and $a_{k_i+1} = a_{k_i+2} = \ldots = a_{k_{i+1}}$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$ with $a_{k_i} = a_{k_j}$ only if $i = j$. The main idea that we will use in the proof is that if

there are not rainbow solutions of (1.1), then $b \notin \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{\sigma(i)}C_i =: S$. Thus to show that (1.1) has a rainbow solution, it is enough to prove the following inequality

$$|S| > |\mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{b\}| = p - 1. \tag{7.1}$$

*Proof. (Theorem 1.2)* First assume that $n = 2$. If $C_1$ and $C_2$ are as in (1.2), then

$$a_1C_1 = -a_2C_1 + b \qquad \text{and} \qquad a_1C_2 = -a_2C_2 + b,$$

and the result is clear. If the coloring is rainbow free with respect to (1.1), then

$$a_1C_1 \cap (-a_2C_2 + b) = \emptyset \qquad \text{and} \qquad a_1C_2 \cap (-a_2C_1 + b) = \emptyset$$

which is equivalent to say that

$$a_1C_1 = -a_2C_1 + b \qquad \text{and} \qquad a_1C_2 = -a_2C_2 + b;$$

then $C_1$ and $C_2$ have to be as in (1.2).

Due to the main result of [6] and the previous paragraph, we may assume that $n > 3$. We shall show (7.1) studying the possibilities of $m$:

Suppose that $m \geq 4$. Then we can find a partition $A_1 \cup A_2$ of $\{a_{k_1}, \ldots, a_{k_m}\}$ with the properties that $\min\{|A_1|, |A_2|\} > 1$ and there are $b_i, c_i \in A_i$ such that $b_i \notin \{\pm c_i\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Assume without loss of generality that $A_1 = \{a_{k_1}, a_{k_2}\}$ and $A_2 = \{a_{k_3}, \ldots, a_{k_m}\}$. Call

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{k_2}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} a_{\sigma(i)}C_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma\in\mathbb{S}_{n-k_2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_2} a_{\sigma(i)+k_2}C_{i+k_2}.$$

If (7.1) is not true, then

$$\max\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} |C_i|, \sum_{i=k_2+1}^{n} |C_i| \right\} \leq p - 5$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} p - 1 &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |S_1 + S_2| \\ &\geq |S_1| + |S_2| - 1 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} |C_i| \right) + 1 + \left( \sum_{i=k_2+1}^{n} |C_i| \right) + 1 - 1 && \text{by Theorem 1.1} \\ &= p + 1 \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

which is false.

Until the end of this proof, we suppose without loss of generality that $k_1 \geq k_2 - k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_m - k_{m-1}$

Suppose that $m = 3$. If $a_{k_1} \neq -a_{k_2}$, write

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)} C_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1} C_{i+k_1};$$

and conclude as in (7.2). If $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$ and $k_2 - k_1 > 1$, we set

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_2 + 1 \\ a_{k_2+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)} C_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1} C_{i+k_1}$$

and conclude as in (7.2). If $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$ and $k_2 - k_1 = 1$, then $k_3 - k_2 = 1$ and thereby $k_1 \geq 2$. If $k_1 > 2$, then we conclude as in (7.2) taking

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)} C_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1} C_{i+k_1}.$$

Now we study the case where $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$, $k_2 - k_1 = k_3 - k_2 = 1$ and $k_1 = 2$. Set $R_{i,j} := a_1 C_i + a_4 C_j \cup a_1 C_j + a_4 C_i$ and $T_{i,j} := a_2 C_i + a_3 C_j \cup a_2 C_j + a_3 C_i$ for each $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$ with $i < j$. If (7.1) is not true, then

$$\begin{aligned} p - 1 &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |R_{1,2} + T_{3,4}| \\ &\geq |R_{1,2}| + \left( \sum_{i=3}^{4} |C_i| \right) - 2 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{2} |C_i| \right) + 1 + \left( \sum_{i=3}^{4} |C_i| \right) - 2 && \text{by Theorem 1.1} \\ &= p - 1 \end{aligned}$$

so $|T_{3,4}| = |C_3| + |C_4| - 1$. As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, there are $r, x, y, c \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $C_3 = r[x, y]$ and $C_4 = r[y + c, x - c]$. In the same way, it can be proven there are $r', x', y', c' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $C_3 = r'[x', y']$ and $C_2 = r'[y' + c', x' - c']$. By Proposition 2.6 we get that $r' \in \{\pm r\}$; we assume without loss of generality that $r' = r$ and thereby $x' = x$ and $y' = y$. Consequently $C_1, C_2, C_3$ and $C_4$ are not pairwise disjoint.

Suppose that $m = 2$. In the case where $a_{k_1} \neq -a_{k_2}$ and $k_2 - k_1 > 1$ or in the case where $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$ and $k_2 - k_1 > 2$, we conclude as in (7.2) with

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)} C_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1} C_{i+k_1}.$$

If $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$ and $(k_1, k_2 - k_1) = (2, 2)$, write $R_{i,j} := a_1 C_i + a_3 C_j \cup a_1 C_j + a_3 C_i$ and $T_{i,j} = a_2 C_i + a_4 C_j \cup a_2 C_j + a_4 C_i$ for $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$ with $i < j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} p - 1 &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |R_{1,2} + T_{3,4}| \\ &\geq |R_{1,2}| + |T_{3,4}| - 1 \qquad \text{by Theorem 2.1.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence $|R_{1,2}| \leq |C_1| + |C_2| - 1$ or $|T_{3,4}| \leq |C_3| + |C_4| - 1$; assume without loss of generality that $|R_{1,2}| \leq |C_1| + |C_2| - 1$. Thus there are $r, x, y, c$ such that $C_1 = r[x, y]$ and $C_2 = r[y + c, x - c]$. Analogously $|R_{1,3}| \leq |C_1| + |C_3| - 1$ or $|T_{2,4}| \leq |C_2| + |C_4| - 1$, and we assume without loss of generality that $|R_{1,3}| \leq |C_1| + |C_3| - 1$ so that there are $r', x', y', c'$ such that $C_1 = r'[x', y']$ and $C_3 = r'[y' + c', x' - c']$. By Proposition 2.6 we conclude that $r' \in \{\pm r\}$; we suppose without loss of generality $r' = r$ so $x' = x$, $y' = y$, and $C_1, C_2, C_3$ are not pairwise disjoint. Now we study the case where $a_{k_1} = -a_{k_2}$, $k_1 > 2$ and $k_2 - k_1 = 2$. Write

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

$$S_1 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)} C_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_2 := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{n-k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)+k_1} C_{i+k_1}.$$

If (7.1) is not true, then

$$\begin{aligned} p - 1 &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |S_1 + S_2| \\ &\geq |S_1| + |S_2| - 1 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq |S_1| + |C_{k_1+1}| + |C_{k_1+2}| - 2 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} |C_i| \right) + 1 - 2 && \text{by Theorem 1.1} \\ &= p - 1 \end{aligned}$$

and all these relations are equalities; in particular, $|S_2| = |C_{k_1+1}|+|C_{k_1+2}|-1$. Then Theorem 1.1 impliesthe existence of $r, x, y, c \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $C_{k_1+2} = r[x, y]$ and $C_{k_1+1} = r[y + c, x - c]$. Define

$$S_1' := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \left( a'_{\sigma(k_1)} C_{k_1+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{k_1-1} a'_{\sigma(i)} C_i \right)$$

and

$$S_2' := a'_{k_1+1} C_{k_1} + a'_{k_1+2} C_{k_1+2} \cup a'_{k_1+1} C_{k_1+2} + a'_{k_1+2} C_{k_1};$$

If we proceed as above (with $(S_1', S_2')$ instead of $(S_1, S_2)$), we may obtain the existence of $r', x', y', c' \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $C_{k_1+2} = r'[x', y']$ and $C_{k_1} = r'[y' + c', x' - c']$. From Proposition 2.6 we deduce that $r' \in \{\pm r\}$; suppose without loss of generality that $r' = r$. Then $x' = x$, $y' = y$, and $C_{k_1}, C_{k_1+1}, C_{k_1+1}$ are not pairwise disjoint. Finally we analyze the case $k_1 - k_2 = 1$. Set

$$a_i' = \begin{cases} a_{k_1} & \text{if } i = k_1 + 1 \\ a_{k_1+1} & \text{if } i = k_1 \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$S' := \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_{k_1}} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a'_{\sigma(i)} C_i;$$

If (7.1) is not true, we get the contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} p - 1 &\geq |S| \\ &\geq |S' + a'_{k_1+1} C_{k_1+1}| \\ &\geq |S'| + |C_{k_1+1}| - 1 && \text{by Theorem 2.1} \\ &\geq \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} |C_i| \right) + 1 + |C_{k_1+1}| - 1 && \text{by Lemma 5.2, Lemma 5.4} \\ & && \text{and Remark 5.3} \\ &= p. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Acknowledgments:** I acknowledge Amanda Montejano who introduced me to the topic and proposed this problem.

## References

## References

[1] A. L. Cauchy, *Recherches sur les nombres*, J. École Polytech. 9 (1813), 99-116.

[2] D. Conlon, *Rainbow solutions of linear equations over* $\mathbb{Z}_p$, Discrete Math. 306 (2006) 2056-2063.

[3] H. Davenport, *On the addition of residue classes*, J. London Math. Soc 10 (1935) 30-32.

[4] H. Davenport, *A historical note*, J. London Math. Soc 22 (1947) 100-101.

[5] G. A. Freiman , *Inverse problems of additive number theory. On the addition of sets of residues with respect to a prime modulus*, Soviet. Math. Dokl. 2 (1961), 1520-1522.

[6] M. Huicochea and A. Montejano , *Rainbow linear equations on three variables in* $\mathbb{Z}_p$, arXiv:1502.04413.

[7] Y.O. Hamidoune and Ø. J. Rødseth , *An inverse theorem mod p*, Acta Arithmetica 92 (2000) 251-262.

[8] V. Jungić, J. Licht, M. Mahdian, J. Nešetřil and R. Radoičić, *Rainbow arithmetic progressions and anti-Ramsey results*, Combin. Probab. Comput. 12 (2003) 599-620.

[9] B. Llano and A. Montejano, *Rainbow-free colorings for* $x + y = cz$ *in* $\mathbb{Z}_p$, Discrete Math. 312 (2012) 2566-2573.

[10] O. Serra and G. Zémor, *On a generalization of a theorem by Vosper*, Volume 0, page Paper A10, 10 p., electronic only-Paper A10, 10 p

[11] G. Vosper, *The critical pairs of subsets of a group of prime order*, J. London Math. Soc. 31 (1956) 200-205.